

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

LT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/451,080 11/30/99 OHMORI

S 024060-114

021839 MM92/0504  
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

SPECTOR, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2873

DATE MAILED:

05/04/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Washington, D.C. 20231

09451080

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT      PAPER

5

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

INTERVIEW SUMMARY (W/ATTACHMENTS) FOLLOWS.



Georgia Epps  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/451,080	OHMORI ET AL.
	Examiner David N Spector	Art Unit 2873

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) David N Spector (examiner of record). (3) \_\_\_\_\_.
- (2) Charles F. Wieland III (attorney of record). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 April 2001.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: .

Claim(s) discussed: 1-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 5886825A; US 5872658A; US 5572277A; US 5717525A; US 5148314 and JP10148757A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Wieland contacted examiner (on or around 4/12/2001) to make USPTO aware of prior art and outstanding claim rejections associated with parent application (09/294,385; filed 4/20/1999; now abandoned). Examiner ordered/inspected the instant application; reviewed/discussed said outstanding rejections w/examiner of record (J.E. Winstedt, AU2872); and examined the prior art listed on all of the forms (PTO-1449, PTO-892) included in the filewrapper for said parent application. The examiner then called Mr. Wieland on 4/17/2001 and informed him that: 1) the outstanding rejections of the parent case did not conflict/contradict with the allowable subject matter noted by the examiner in the instant case, and 2) that the examiner was aware of the aforesaid prior art inasmuch as it was reviewed by the examiner during the examination of the instant application on 3/26/2001. Mr. Wieland faxed a letter summarizing the aforesaid information and a copy of a form PTO-1449 enumerating the prior art noted above. This form has been initialed by the examiner and it will be incorporated into the instant filewrapper along with said letter. The references thereon will not be listed on the face of a patent issuing from the instant application, however, since the examiner did not find them to be particularly relevant to the prosecution of the instant case.

Patent  
Attorney's Docket No. 024060-114

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of )  
Shigeto OHMORI et al. ) Group Art Unit: 2873 FAX COPY RECEIVED  
Application No.: 09/451,080 ) Examiner: D. Spector APR 17, 2001  
Filed: November 30, 1999 )  
For: LENS OPTICAL SYSTEM ) TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

**LETTER CONCERNING ART CITED IN PARENT APPLICATION**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Spector for the time spent reviewing the above-captioned application. The undersigned pointed out that the parent application (Application No. 09/294,385) had received an Office Action in which a different Examiner cited three references which are not made of record in the present application and that the claims overlapped. Examiner Spector was fully aware of the additional references cited in the parent application and indicated that he would make them of record in the present application. To this end, Applicants attach form PTO-1449 listing the Estelle et al. Patent (U.S. Patent 5,717,525), the Chen Patent (U.S. Patent 5,148,314), Japanese Patent Publication 10-148757 (copy attached), the Bietry Patent (U.S. Patent 5,886,825), the Ori Patent (U.S. Patent 5,872,658) and Uzawa et al. Patent (U.S. Patent 5,572,277).

The undersigned appreciates Examiner Spector's clear articulation of the differences between the art applied in the parent application and the pending claims, those differences being captured in large part by the Examiner's Statement for Reasons of Allowance.


PART OF PAGE 5

Application No. 09/451,080  
Attorney's Docket No. 024060-114  
Page 2

Return of the Examiner initialed copy of the enclosed form PTO-1449 is respectfully requested. Examiner Spector was kind enough to indicate that he would initial the form PTO-1449 insofar has he did consider the references. Copies of the U.S. patents are not being supplied insofar as the Examiner indicated that he already had possession of said copies. It was not clear if the Examiner had a copy of Japanese Patent Publication 10-148757, so it is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: 

Charles F. Wieland III  
Registration No. 33,096

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620

Date: April 17, 2001